1st February 1929]

Mr. D. NARAYANA RAJU :—" Will the hon. Member be pleased to communicate this question and answer to the Engineer-in-Chief, Cauvery-Mettur Project ? "

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—" Certainly, Sir."

## Land Revenue

*Failure of crops in Palghat taluk.*

* 1377-A Q.—Mr. K. MADHAVAN NAYAR : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that due to the failure of the north-eastern monsoons the second crop has almost completely failed in Palghat taluk ;

(b) whether the Government propose to make any remission of revenue on account of this failure ; and

(c) whether they propose to consider the question of undertaking irrigation works in the Palghat taluk or any other portion of Malabar in the immediate future ?

A.—(a) The Government are not aware that the facts are as suggested.

(b) Save where the second crop has been compounded for, remission is granted for its loss under the ordinary rules, and no orders of Government are required.

(c) The hon. Member is referred to the answer given to question No. 909 on 29th November 1928. The position remains unchanged.

Mr. K. MADHAVAN NAYAR :—" Is the hon. Member in possession of information not given so far in respect of the failure of crops in Palghat ? "

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—" I have none."

Mr. K. MADHAVAN NAYAR :—" May I know why Government says, 'Government are not aware that the facts are as suggested.' Is there any implication that the facts as suggested are not true ? "

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—" There is no implication except that the Government are not aware of the facts stated."

*Failure of second crops in Palghat taluk.*

* 1377-B Q.—Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the rainfall has been very much below the normal this year in the Palghat taluk and whether the Government have received any report from the local authorities about it ;

(b) whether the first paddy crop in that taluk was defective and whether the second crop has completely failed ; and

(c) whether there are any recommendations for remission of kist, and if so, to what effect ?

A.—(a) The rainfall recorded at 3 rainguage stations in the Palghat taluk from June to December 1928 averaged 58 inches the normal being 78 inches. The Season Reports for December stated that in that taluk the supply of water was insufficient.

[1st February 1929

(b) The Government are not aware that this is so.

(c) The Government have not received any recommendations. The orders of Government are not required for granting remission of the second crop charge on single crop wet land in cases when the second crop has failed.

*Execution of kudimaramat works.*

*1378 Q.—Mr. A. PARASURAMA RAO: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether there are any records to show that a particular work comes under the category of kudimaramat works;

(b) whether any investigation was made at the time of settlement that a particular work must be maintained by customary labour;

(c) whether the fixing of the rate of assessment has anything to do with the contribution of labour by the ryots for such works;

(d) if so, what percentage was deducted for such a contribution of labour by the ryots;

(e) whether it is entirely left to the Public Works Department authorities or the Revenue authorities to decide whether a particular work is to be maintained by customary labour or otherwise;

(f) whether any co-operative societies have been formed for the execution of kudimaramat works, and if so, how many and when;

(g) whether it is a fact that the Settlement Officers take into consideration the labour of the ryot in lifting water for irrigation of his lands and whether a remission of 25 per cent is allowed in such cases;

(h) whether it is a fact that a similar remission of 25 per cent in the assessment is made in the case of dasabandham works;

(i) whether no such consideration was shown in the case of kudimaramat works;

(j) if so, whether the Government will now at least make such concession;

(k) whether the removal of prickly-pear growth is one of the items included in the kudimaramat works, and under what authority;

(l) whether any register of the kind referred to in G.O. Mis. No. 2463, Revenue, dated 30th November 1927, was maintained before the said Government Order was passed; and

(m) if so, whether the hon. Member will be pleased to place it on the table of the House?

A.—(a), (b) & (k) The hon. Member is referred to the answer to clauses (a) to (c) of question No. 602 answered on 12th October 1928.

(c) & (d) The answer is in the negative.

(e) The Public Works Department authorities have no voice in the matter. If by local custom any work is usually executed by the joint labour of a village community and if the community fails or neglects to execute the work, the Revenue officers enforce the provisions of section 6 of Madras Act I of 1858.

(f) Yes. There were eight societies on 30th June 1928. Two of them were registered in 1923, four in 1924, one in 1927 and one in 1928.